



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,537	07/14/1999	STEPHEN Y.F. PANG	19009-000420	3726

7590

10/07/2003

RICHARD T OGAWA  
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
8TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941113834

EXAMINER

HO, CHUONG T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2664

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Advisory Action

Application No.

09/353,537

Applicant(s)

Stephen Y. Pang

Examiner

Ho

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Sep 2, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires four months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See attachment
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-12
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2664

1. The amendment (A) filed 04/10/2003 and the amendment (D) filed 09/02/03 have been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's argument filed 04/10/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per to Applicant's argument, see page 11, lines 4-5, the Applicant's argue in substance the following:

"Clearly, even if the references were combined, neither show or suggest the "policing server," in the manner claimed."

The Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument, Mc Cormick et al. shows an address filtering server which serves as the policing server. Mc Cormick further shows updating of the banned/barred address list by the user (see col. 2, lines 53-63).

What Mc Cormick does not show is SPAM icon. Note that Mc Cormick discloses the user of a "Trash Bin" for discarding e-mail whose address would have to be added to the banned list (No Admittance list). It is well known that the GUI interfaces "Trash Bin" represented by a trash can icon. Clearly, these icons are used in most windowed type operating system.

A benefit to this action is that recipient need not perform any special action besides selecting the one button "SPAM" button.

McCormick et al. discloses the policing server (see col. 6, lines 34-38, the address filter server 22 would relay e-mail filter user requests to the filter database (no admittance address list, guest


Art Unit: 2664

address list) of the database server 24 and meeting appropriate calls via RPC to library on the database server or by sending SQL commences to the database directory. The address filter service will be implemented via connection based (TCP) communication).

3. Claims 1-12 are pending.
4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be direct to Chuong Ho whose telephone number is (703) 306-4529.

CH

Date 10-02-03



WELLINGTON CHIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600